

Subject

OGC Has Reviewed

23 October 1952

Mr. Titus de Bobula
6825 Red Top Road
Apartment #3
Takoma Park, Maryland

Dear Mr. de Bobula:

I received your letter of October 17, 1952 setting forth additional details of your business dealings with Miss [REDACTED] STATINTL
I have now had an opportunity to look into this situation. From what I have discovered, I am afraid that this Agency can take no further action in this matter and that if you still are of the opinion that Miss [REDACTED] is defaulting upon her obligation, you must seek a private remedy through ordinary legal means. As I explained to you in my earlier letter, we cannot act as a collection agency nor can we give orders to an employee in her matters of a private nature. STATINTL

I have spoken to Miss [REDACTED] and at her request, to Mr. [REDACTED] STATINTL
Piecing together what they have told me against the background that your letters have furnished, I can only conclude that there is a basic misunderstanding between you as to the character of the payments that Miss [REDACTED] has been making to you. Apparently STATINTL
the reason that you originally conveyed title to Miss [REDACTED] was to enable them to arrange, if possible, some settlement with various parties who have moved into possession of your neglected piece of property and asserted claims adverse to your own. STATINTL
[REDACTED] evidently have reconveyed to you an undivided one-quarter interest in the property as your insurance of receiving an agreed upon sum out of any settlement that they may be able to negotiate. Of course, you are entitled to record this deed whenever you wish. STATINTL

[REDACTED] states to me that she has paid to you or Mrs. de Bobula a total of approximately \$1000, \$300 at the time of delivery of the deed and monthly installments of \$100 each since that time. She states that she has promised you only to do what she is able from time to time and this not from financial obligation, but only from a desire to help you. She explains that she simply was unable to send you anything on October 1st.

You have asserted that the figure of \$1500 was the agreed upon price. Inasmuch as [REDACTED] denies this and states that the only agreement was that you receive \$12,500 out of any settlement concluded

STATINTL

as evidenced by the deed you hold, I regretfully must tell you that we cannot assist you further in correcting this misunderstanding. There is nothing on the face of this that reflects any discredit upon Miss [REDACTED]'s actions.

Very truly yours,

Laurence R. Houston
General Counsel

OGC/LRH/GHK:imm

Distribution -
Orig - Addressee
2 - OGC